



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,866	02/26/2002	Gregg S. Sutton	CRD-0992	1387
27777	7590	07/18/2005	EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			THALER, MICHAEL H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3731	

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/083,866

Applicant(s)

SUTTON ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Thaler

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3731

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no basis in the original disclosure for the limitations in claim 1, lines 15-17 that 1) one end of the fiber (as opposed to some other portion) is affixed to the filter membrane and 2) the second end of the fiber extends towards the inner region of the holes (as opposed to a direction out of the plane of the filter membrane, for example).

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaganov et al. (5,876,367) in view of either Blum (4,230,119) or Miller et al. (3,889,685) and further in view of Engelson et al. (5,423,849). Kaganov et al., in figure 6 show a proximal member (the right branch of tubular member 10 within vessel 61, i.e. the portion of member 10 within vessel 61 which extends from its right extreme end to the location where it intersects with the upper branch labeled 14 in figure 3), a distal member (the left branch of tubular member 10 within vessel 61), the proximal and distal members each having a first lumen 37 and a second lumen (the main passageway within the

Art Unit: 3731

member) and an inflatable balloon 35, a middle section (the middle section of tubular member 10 which includes upper branch 14) having a third lumen (the main lumen in the middle section which extends along the longitudinal axis of the vessel) in fluid communication with each second lumen, a fifth lumen (the lumen of branch 14) in fluid communication with a second port (at valve 16) and a vascular filter system 41, 42 comprising guidewire 41, a filter membrane support structure (e.g. the umbrella frame described in col. 9, lines 64-67) and a filter membrane having holes of diameters which are "variable", depending on the pore size which is chosen for the particular filter as described in col. 9, lines 7-37. Kaganov et al. fail to show a single inflation port in fluid communication with each first lumen in order to permit simultaneous inflation of both balloons. However, Blum teaches using a single inflation port (at 12, 13) for inflation of both balloons simultaneously and Miller et al. teach that two ports may be replaced by a single port connected to both balloon conduits apparently in order to permit faster and more convenient inflation of both balloons (col. 4, lines 8-12). It would have been obvious to connect each Kaganov et al. lumen 37 together to form a single inflation port for inflation of both balloons simultaneously in order to permit faster and more convenient inflation of both balloons in

Art Unit: 3731

view of either of the secondary references. With this modification, the Kaganov et al. middle section would include a fourth lumen in fluid communication with each first (inflation) lumen as claimed. Kaganov et al. fail to disclose one or more fibers attached to the filter membrane adjacent to the circumference of the holes. However, Engelson et al. teach that fibers (144 or 152) should be attached to a porous material in order to better capture and blood clots. It would have been obvious to attach fibers to the Kaganov et al. filter so that it too would have this advantage. As to claim 2, Kaganov et al. fail to disclose the openings being non-uniformly spaced. However, it is old and well known in this art to so space filter openings in order to optimize the filtering process. It would have been obvious to make the openings of the Kaganov et al. filter non-uniformly spaced so that it too would have this advantage. The above well known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion (M.P.E.P. 2144.03).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3731

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Thaler whose telephone number is (571)272-4704. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan T. Nguyen can be reached on (571)272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

mht
7/11/05



MICHAEL THALER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3731